

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts

March 11, 1980

AM

10:00

CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

- A. Dates of next meetings: April 8, 1980
May 13, 1980
- B. Approval of February 12, 1980 minutes.
- C. Commission of Fine Arts House Appropriation Hearings,
March 10, 1980.
- D. Commission of Fine Arts testimony on Georgetown
Waterfront Park proposal before Senate Committee on
Energy and Natural Resources, March 3, 1980.

AM

10:30

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. D.C. Department of Housing and Economic Development

1. Old Georgetown Act

- a. O.G. 80-42, 3020 K Street, N.W. Harbour Associates,
new mixed use waterfront proposal, new design.
- b. O.G. 80-31, 2929 M Street, N.W. National Savings
and Trust Company, revised designs for new bank
building.
- c. O.G. 80-35, 1020 33rd Street, N.W. Raze existing
PEPCO substation prior to building new substation
and office building.

1. Old Georgetown Act continued

- d. O.G. 80-33, 2833 M Street, N.W., review working drawings, Deanwood Development.
- e. O.G. 80-37, 3027 N Street, N.W. Installation of driveway and garage in the west end of the basement (ground) floor, similar to adjacent residence.
- f. O.G. 80-41, 3277 M Street, N.W. Mixed use complex residential/retail/garage, M and Potomac Ltd. Partnership.
- g. Appendix I

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

- a. S.L. 80-20 & 21, 2320 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Addition to chancery of the Republic of Korea.
- b. Appendix II

B. National Park Service, National Capital Region

- 1. CFA MAR/11/80 - 1, Review of possible sites for relocating Park Police Stables.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

- 1. CFA MAR/11/80 - 2, Old Post Office, improvements to Pennsylvania Avenue, between 10th and 13th Streets.

III. LEGISLATION

A. Office of Management and Budget

- 1. CFA MAR/11/80 - 3, Request views on H.R. 4279, "To establish a commission to study the feasibility of construction a monument dedicated to the duties and responsibilities of citizens of the United States."

B. Committee on Governmental Affairs

- 2. CFA MAR/11/80 - 4, Request views of S. 1814, "A Bill to provide for a National Afro-American History and Culture Commission, which shall establish the National Center of Afro-American History and Culture, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

March 11, 1980

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 80-26	1630-1636 35th Street, N.W.	Resubmission of elevations
HPA. 80-176	3501-3663 Reservoir Road, N.W. Convent Gardens Corporation	

ACTION: Request additional studies, working drawings, landscape plan and on-site material samples for review. Site plan approval confirmed and preliminary designs approved for design development and further review by the Georgetown Board.

O.G. 80-34	3219 M Street, N.W.	Erect awning over storefront
HPA. 80-197	Long Rap Inc.	

ACTION: Issue permit. Recommend awning with simple valence not to exceed 12". Also omit end panels. Recommend role type awning.

O.G. 80-38	1058 Thomas Jefferson Pl. N.W.	Repaint new bank name "1st
HPA. 80-210	1st American Bank	American Bank, Money Exchange," on two existing double faced colonial style hanging signs.

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to re-use of existing colonial style hanging signs for new bank name. "First American Bank."

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

March 11, 1980

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 80-14 HPA. 80-181	740 15th Street, N.W. Union First National Bank	Fill in the court and extend two stories above present roof interior remodeling of the existing building.

ACTION: Working drawings and material samples requested as ready.
Preliminary design approved.

S.L. 80-16	2217 N Street, N.W. 2217 N Street, Corp.	Build a new apartment building.
------------	---	---------------------------------

ACTION: Working drawings and material samples requested as ready. Preliminary design approved.

S.L. 80-17 HPA. 80-211	444 North Capitol Street, N.W. 1st American Bank	Reface two existing signs to read "1st American Bank from Union 1st Bank. No change in color or materials.
---------------------------	---	--

ACTION: Issue permit.

S.L. 80-18	502 23rd Street, N.W. 1st American Bank	Change identification sign from Union 1st to 1st American Bank.
------------	--	---

ACTION: Issue permit.

S.L. 80-19	2021 K Street, N.W. 1st American Bank	Change identification sign from Union 1st to 1st American Bank.
------------	--	---

ACTION: Returned to the D.C. Permits Branch, not under Fine Arts jurisdiction.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

11 March 1980

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:

Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman

Hon. Philip W. Buchen

Hon. Victorine DuPont Homsey

Hon. Frederick D. Nichols

Georgetown Board

Member Present:

Mr. David N. Yerkes

Staff Present:

Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary

Mr. Jeffrey Carson

Mrs. Sue Kohler

National Capital Planning

Commission Staff Present:

Mr. Robert Gresham

D.C. Historic Preservation

Office Staff Present:

Ms. Lucy Franklin

Ms. Tanya Beauchamp

I. ADMINISTRATION

- A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 8 April 1980
13 May 1980

The Chairman requested that the date of the September 1980 meeting be changed from the 9th to the 3rd of the month. This was agreed to by the other members present.

- B. Minutes of 12 February 1980 meeting, approved.

C. Commission of Fine Arts House Appropriations Hearings, 10, March 1980. The Secretary reported that the Commission's testimony requesting an appropriation of \$294,000 for FY 1981 had been favorably received.

D. Commission of Fine Arts testimony on Georgetown Waterfront Park Proposal before Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 3 March 1980. The Secretary reported that most of the testimony given was in favor of the all park scheme, although the Interior Department testified against it. He said the Commission's testimony would be included in the minutes of this meeting. Mr. Buchen asked if Interior's opposition was based on its previous approval of the Task Force Agreement supporting development; the Secretary said this probably had some bearing on it, but as the Agreement is not binding, he felt the primary reason was the fiscal concern. The Chairman added that Senator Hatfield was able to get each witness to say that a park would be the best use of the site if the money were forthcoming. EXHIBIT A.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. D.C. Department of Housing and Economic Development

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 80-42, 3020 K Street, N.W. Harbour Associates, new mixed use waterfront proposal, new design. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the Commission's previous disapproval (December 1979) of another design for this site, presented by the same developer. The design was considered completely unacceptable by reason of its excessive mass. The scheme presented at this meeting was totally new and designed by a different architect. The Assistant Secretary introduced the developer, Herbert Miller, who said the new design was an attempt to meet the Commission's objections to his first proposal. He then introduced the architect, Arthur Cotton Moore, who discussed his designs.

Mr. Moore first called attention to the pedestrian connection he had worked out to link his project with the Foggy Bottom Metro Station. This would utilize an existing unused freeway section bridging Rock Creek Parkway. Plans for a shuttle bus connection from the project (at 30th Street) were also pointed out. Mr. Moore then discussed the public streets and rights-of-way and how they would be treated where they run through the project. The diagonal right-of-way of Virginia Avenue (never cut through) would become a pedestrian thoroughfare linking Wisconsin Avenue and the access to the Metro station and would also serve to break up the building masses in the project. The north-south streets--31st, Thomas Jefferson, and 30th--would be extended through the project, each at a width of 60 feet, thus preserving the views from the north part of the historic district down to the river and keeping the traditional block concept of Georgetown.

The focal point of the project would be an elliptical boat basin at the foot of Thomas Jefferson Street. Small boats could enter this for docking, and during flood conditions, gates would close it off. A floating dock at this point would also enable people to approach the river's edge at only four feet above water level. Mr. Moore stressed his attempt, in this design, to provide accessibility to the river for all those visiting the area, not just those who live or work in the project. The height of

the townhouses placed at the perimeter of the project would be 35 feet, typical of the houses in the historic district. These would all be similar in style, but with subtle variations.

Joseph Brown from EDAW, planners and landscape architects, then discussed the park aspects of the plan. He said it had been determined that the Wisconsin Avenue terminus would be the best place on the waterfront for an all park use. Drawings showed an informally landscaped development for the area just east of Wisconsin Avenue, with mounds, meadows, fountains, etc., while the area to the west toward Key Bridge (not part of this developer's site) could be devoted to more active recreation. The waterfront park would vary from 53' on private land to 350 feet in depth on public land, and in Brown's opinion, would be much more effective for park use than the 160 foot strip provided by the Task Force Agreement.

Mr. Moore returned to discuss the residential-commercial mix in the project, saying that it would be 60% residential (apartments and townhouses). All apartments in close proximity to the freeway would be through units, with their major spaces facing the water. There would be 2-3 apartments in the tall tower at the boat basin, with the upper part of this structure being purely decorative. He said he had placed the tower, boat basin and curved building at the foot of Thomas Jefferson Street because he felt the need of a strong statement at this point to relate to the monumental area of the river beyond--the Watergate buildings and the Kennedy Center. Shops would occupy the street grade floors of the major buildings and the oppressive effect of the freeway would be lightened by a glazed hanging canopy, lighted from above, which recalled the form of the canopies of the Art Nouveau Metro entrances in Paris.

The Chairman asked Mr. Moore what other visual references and connotations he had in mind when designing this project. The architect replied that the contemporary townhouse-shop grouping around Lake Anne in Reston and the 18th century Bath Crescent had both come to mind.

In reply to a question regarding the wisdom of placing shops at grade level on a site known as a flood plain, Mr. Moore replied that flood conditions had been very thoroughly investigated and he was satisfied that there would be no problem. Mr. Nichols asked about building heights throughout the project; Mr. Moore said they ran from 35 feet for the townhouses to 60 feet for the mid-rise sections, and up to 86 feet for the tallest section on K Street. The Chairman asked if 86 feet was higher than the Task Force Agreement would have allowed, and Mr. Moore said yes. Mr. Brown was questioned about the character of the landscaping. He said there would be an extensive use of grass, low ground covers, and pebble paths. Streets would all be pedestrian; underground parking would be provided for cars.

David Yerkes, representing the Georgetown Board, reported the Board's reaction to the design, saying first that the members would still prefer the all park scheme because Georgetown has already reached the saturation point with building. He said there was concern over the height and bulk of this new project, from the visual point of view as well as that of

overcrowding. On the other hand, the Board liked many aspects--the way the design took advantage of the waterfront location, the reduction in mass and length along K Street, the small scale at the edges, and the opening up of Virginia Avenue and the north-south streets, and the Metro connection.

Mr. Miller then introduced Robert McGowan, president of Chessie Resources, who reviewed briefly his company's ownership of land since the turn of the century, and its efforts to find a suitable use for it since it has not been needed for railroad purposes. He said he did not think the all park scheme was feasible financially and hoped that this new scheme, in which development was limited to half that allowed by zoning (an FAR of 2.5 rather than 6, as allowed), would be favorably considered by the Commission of Fine Arts.

A large number of citizens were present at the meeting, and several of them wished to be heard. The first speaker was James Denson, president of the D.C. Chamber of Commerce. He recalled the many plans for the Georgetown waterfront, the fact that no action had yet been taken, and noted that the planning process in Georgetown had not included minorities. He said that in view of the present economic situation in the city and in the nation as a whole, a hard look must be taken at the economic consequences of a park versus a development scheme. He noted that other cities have been able to make the best use of their waterfront areas, both economically and esthetically.

Robin Jones, a Georgetown resident, said she was in favor of the development because Georgetown already has Montrose Park, and the waterfront development would give people some place to go and be more challenging than another park area.

The Reverend Wright, secretary of the Baptist Ministers Conference, said he was alarmed that such a large sum--perhaps 40 million-- could be considered for a park at this time when citizens and the city government are facing economic hardship and the development would mean jobs and taxes.

Katharine Sullivan, representing the ANC and the Citizens Association of Georgetown, said the all park solution was supported by citizens' groups throughout the city, not just in Georgetown. She said she was worried about the congestion which would result if this project were built, and about the possibility of much of the residential space being converted to hotel use. She stated also that the architectural style was more suited to downtown than Georgetown.

Grosvenor Chapman, architect, representing the Citizens Association of Georgetown, first noted the importance of making clear the fact that the parkland shown on the models and drawings west of 31st Street was D.C. land, not land being given up by the developer for park use. The privately owned land would be developed intensively. He noted that this project went back to matter-of-right zoning, not to the Task Force Agreement, and if the Commission approved it, there would be no control over the

use of the interior space. He said this project would bring a 40% increase in the commercial development in Georgetown and that at least 300,000 square feet of commercial space would be permitted under zoning. Mr. Chapman also commented on the Metro connection, saying that it had been overrated and would not shorten the distance significantly. He felt that the design of the project was not appropriate to Georgetown, and explained the long history of plans but no action on the waterfront by saying that nothing appropriate had yet been submitted.

Elizabeth Rowe, former chairman of the Planning Commission and present chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, said that her preference for the all park scheme, expressed at the December meeting, had not changed. She congratulated Mr. Moore on his design, but said it should not be built on this site. She said she was also very worried about the possibility of flooding. Mrs. Rowe suggested the possibility of a trade-off of other Federal land between the Government and the developer, as was done at Glen Echo Park.

Mr. Moore replied to several of the criticisms made by saying that (1) the Committee of One Hundred had yet to see this design, and (2) the Metro connection would indeed simplify what is now a circuitous and hazardous walk.

The next speaker was Ann Satterthwaite, a recreational planner and Georgetown resident. She commented that this was still a massive development on a critical site, subject to flooding, and that such development should not be allowed. She said Washington needs a water-based recreational area along the river; a city-wide park, not one for Georgetown residents only. She added that this is the only place on the river where a roadway does not cut the major part of the open space off from the river.

Ray Kukulski, ANC Chairman, asked to point out one thing--the possibly disastrous effect an accident involving fire on the freeway could have on the housing units in close proximity to it.

Anne Sellin, representing the Citizens Planning Coalition, said her group, with representatives from all wards, was concerned about the bulk of this project and felt that this area did not need more development. She pointed out that access to it would be difficult, and asked that an environmental impact study be made. She noted that the mayor and numerous citizens associations had come out in favor of the all park solution.

Charles Poor, president of the Georgetown Citizens Association, repeated his organization's endorsement of the park scheme, saying that the height and bulk of this development were excessive for Georgetown even though the design did have its good points. He said the District Government had agreed to forego the taxes from this area if the Federal Government would provide funds for purchase.

The last speaker was Michael Sussman, who formerly managed the Antiques Fair in the old ice house on K Street near Key Bridge. He said the venture had been unsuccessful because people refused to come down under the freeway, and he stated that a park in this area would fail to attract people for the same reason.

After everyone had been heard, the Chairman summarized the Commission's reaction to the project by saying that it had gone a long way toward observing the comments made at the December 1979 meeting, particularly in the reduction of mass, the opening up of access to the water, and the preservation of the views down the north-south streets. He said the Commission liked the use of the boat basin as a focal point and admired the creativity of the design, but still found the project too high and bulky. He reiterated the Commission's desire to see only park use for this site and said the project was being reviewed only because the possibility of bringing this about was still uncertain.

He said the Commission concurred with the report of the Old Georgetown Board and reminded the developer that a sixty foot maximum height had been consistently recommended for the area and followed by other developers. EXHIBIT B

Mr. Moore asked the Chairman if the Commission would give partial approval to the project, to those elements it liked. The Chairman said the Commission would certainly have to see more detailed drawings of all elements, but at this time did look favorably on the concept of the crescent plan, opening up of Virginia Avenue and the north-south streets, and in general the type of development shown for the southern part of the project. Mr. Moore and Mr. Miller said the northern portion of the project could be restudied, with Mr. Moore adding that two floors could be removed from the 86 foot high building, thus bringing it close to the 60 foot limit. EXHIBIT B-1

b. O.G. 80-31, 2929 M Street, N.W. National Savings and Trust Company, revised designs for new bank building. Staff member Jeffrey Carson reviewed the Commission's previous request for more study of the relationship of the main octagonal building to its appendages and to the row of townhouses to the east; he then introduced architect James Murphy. Mr. Murphy showed three schemes with varying treatment of the roof and cornice lines and the entrance gate element. The Chairman and the other members preferred Scheme B because of its simpler roof lines, but all thought the small rectangular building should have windows on the street side. The Secretary called attention to the all glass link between the main building and the appendage, suggesting that its contemporary character seemed out of place. Noting these reservations, preliminary approval was given to Scheme B with the recommendation that Mr. Murphy work with the Georgetown Board on developing the design according to the Commission's suggestions. EXHIBIT C

c. O.G. 80-35, 1020 33rd Street, N.W. Raze existing PEPCO substation prior to building new substation and office building. The Assistant Secretary outlined this project: the building of a new substation at the south end of the property (the northwest corner of K and 33rd), the demolition of the old substation to the north, and its replacement with a new office building. Conceptual plans for the new substation included retention of the old industrial type brick and stone facades at 33rd and K Streets. The west facade of the old building would be demolished. Staff member Sue Kohler reported that the old building, erected in 1888, was originally an architectural iron works and was purchased by PEPCO in the mid-1890's. The north building, now used as a substation, was erected in 1898, although parts of it may date from 1888. As the

architect, Theodore F. Mariani, said he planned to retain the two most important facades (at the corner of 33rd and K), there was no objection to the razing of the rest of the old structures, which cannot feasibly be retained for any other use because of interior construction. Plans for the new office building, shown only in conceptual form on the drawings, will be submitted later.

d. O.G. 80-33, 2833 M Street, N.W., review working drawings, Deanwood Development. The Assistant Secretary stated that the working drawings for this project, which had been seen by the Georgetown Board, were being submitted to the Commission primarily for review of the window details, specifically muntin size, because there had been some concern about this. The architect, Guy Martin, said he needed 1 1/2 inch wide muntins for the large front window, which will be operable, and preferred to keep them the same size for the other windows. He said the pane size for all the windows will be about 19 by 13 inches, and recalled that the windows in the British Embassy have panes and muntins of similar size.

The Chairman and Mr. Nichols both observed that the comparison was not particularly appropriate since the British Embassy is a much larger building. However, the Chairman thought this matter should probably be left to the architect's discretion, and the other members agreed. The other detail discussed was the type of brick to be used around the windows. Mr. Martin said he would prefer to use a solid color red brick in order to provide a slight contrast with the wall brick, in which variations in color occur. There was no objection to this and the details were approved.

e. O.G. 80-37, 3027 N Street, N.W. Installation of driveway and garage in the west end of the basement (ground) floor, similar to adjacent residence. The Secretary showed photographs of this double house and said the submission was for a garage and driveway on the west to match one already existing on the east. As the construction would again make the houses symmetrical, it was approved. The members wished to make it clear, however, that this was not to set a precedent and they still wanted to adhere to the policy of not allowing driveway and garage construction destructive of the streetscape.

f. O.G. 80-41, 3277 M Street, N.W. Mixed use complex residential/retail/garage, M and Potomac Ltd. Partnership. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this mixed use project and said that, in general, the Georgetown Board had approved the working drawings, although they had recommended vinyl clad wood sash instead of aluminum. Also, they had not been able to review the drawings for the residential facade on Potomac Street, because this facade technically needed Board of Zoning Appeals approval before a permit could be issued. The members felt they could reaffirm their recommendation at this time that a variance be granted if needed to allow residential construction, but they could not approve the working drawings as a whole without review of this facade. Should the variance not be granted, the Commission would request the opportunity to review elevation and landscaping designs for the Potomac Street frontage.

g. Appendix I, approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 80-20 & 21, 2320 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Addition to chancery of the Republic of Korea. The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for alterations and additions to the Korean chancery on Sheridan Circle. Staff member Jeffrey Carson said this Beaux Arts style house, built in 1917 by Harry Wardman, had not been included in the Massachusetts Avenue studies because it was not as important, architecturally or historically, as many others but was nonetheless significant because it contributed to the strong Beaux Arts character of Sheridan Circle. The Assistant Secretary introduced Kirkwood White, attorney for the Korean Government, who said the house had been purchased by the Koreans in 1949. Since that time their chancery needs have expanded, and at present are spread out over several different locations. The Government would like to consolidate them in the Sheridan Circle building. Mr. White said the building falls within the diplomatic zoning area and is also in the Massachusetts Avenue Historic District; as such, it falls under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Landmarks. He said there would be a zoning hearing in May; the building is in an R3D zone where an FAR of 1.5 is permitted. EXHIBIT D

Paul McGowan, representing John Carl Warnecke and Associates, architects discussed the proposals. He noted first that there had been several additions to the building since it was built in 1918, including one in 1949 which extended the facade (although not the mansard floor) to the north. He said the building is not antiquated, and the Koreans first asked that it be demolished and replaced with a new structure. The Warnecke firm advised them that this was not feasible in an historic area and suggested alterations and additions instead. Through the use of drawings and a model, Mr. McGowan explained his proposals. The facade and front portion of the building would remain and would be linked with new construction at the north, south and west through a central rotunda and stair. The new construction would differ half a floor level from the old. It would comply with present zoning and provide nearly 32,000 square feet of space. There would be 2-3 floors of parking underground to accommodate 68 cars. At ground level, the area which would be used for the new addition is now a parking lot for 34 cars. The new additions would be of limestone to match the original and would be designed in a similar style. Completing the mansard in front would bring the height to 47 feet, 7 more than allowed by zoning.

A number of neighbors and other interested citizens were present and asked to comment. Charles Robertson from the National Collection of Fine Arts, which operates the 1902 Barney Studio House next door as part of the Smithsonian, discussed the impact of the proposed alterations on this museum. He distributed a history of Barney House to the members and noted Alice Pike Barney's death in 1931 and the gift of the house in 1960 to the Smithsonian. He commented on the pleasant character of the Korean chancery as it now stands next to Barney House and deplored the massive scale of the proposed additions. He suggested that instead of destroying the scale of the Sheridan Circle, the Koreans should build a new chancery elsewhere. Mr. Robertson said that the Landmarks Committee had reviewed

the proposal, and while no action was taken, comments were made on the large scale of the addition and the effect on the circle. He noted also the adverse effect on traffic around the circle from cars entering and leaving the parking levels.

Paul Rasmussen, a structural engineer for the Smithsonian, commented on the possible future damage to Barney House from the excavations for the underground parking. He said that both the Portrait Gallery-NCFA building and the Freer Gallery have suffered from Metro construction.

Theodore Dominick, representing the Sheridan Circle-Kalorama Citizens' Association, said his group had fought the extension of chanceries in this area in the past and would continue to do so in this case.

Katherine Sullivan, representing ANC 3A (Georgetown) and the Georgetown Citizens' Association, said the historic residential character of the area must be preserved; she also commented on the great bulk of the addition as seen from Rock Creek Park.

Anne Sellin, from the Dupont Circle Citizens' Association, said that while the design was interesting, it was too large and bulky for the site. She noted that the excavation would come within eight feet of the Barney carriage house and very close to Mr. Dillon Ripley's house to the north. She, too, commented on the traffic problem and said this addition, if approved, would set a precedent for other foreign governments to enlarge their chanceries.

Mrs. Mary Ripley, resident of the house to the north, objected to the bulk and mass, the closing of views, destruction of park trees and the excavation near her house.

James Goode, representing Col. Julius Wadsworth, owner of a nearby residence, said the addition would destroy the park-like setting which had attracted the Wadsworths to Sheridan Circle. He suggested the Koreans build a new chancery in a commercial area.

Mrs. Leila Washburn, another neighbor, objected to the potential destruction of the garden-like character of the area and noted that Sheridan Circle is one of the few left in the city which retains its original residences. She commented also on the fact that the Koreans have already destroyed the landscaping in front of another nearby house owned by them, 2370 Massachusetts Avenue, a structure documented in the Commission's first Massachusetts Avenue study.

The Chairman then commented on the Commission's reaction to the proposal. He said that after publishing two books on Massachusetts Avenue architecture, the Commission was generally interested in the area and in preserving the residential character of Sheridan Circle, as well as sympathetic to keeping chanceries out of residential areas. However, under the Shipstead-Luce Act, the effect of the proposal on Rock Creek Park was the only aspect the Commission could speak to. There was a

consensus among the members that the very large, bulky west wing facing the park threatened both trees and view and could not be approved in its present form. Although filling out the mansard area on the front facade seemed a good idea and some other additions might be tolerated, it was felt that, as presented, the project was too bulky.

b. Appendix 2, approved.

B. National Park Services, National Capital Region

1. CFA 11/MAR/80 - 1, Review of possible sites for relocating Park Police Stables. The Assistant Secretary introduced John Parsons from the Park Service, who explained to the members that the stables presently being used are temporary structures on the Mall, erected during the Folk Life Festival. While inadequate, they are convenient to the Mall, where the horses are needed. However, Mr. Parson said there had been complaints, and so other sites are being investigated. Slides were shown of (1) a site between the 14th Street bridges, which has the disadvantage of Metro noise, disturbing to horses; (2) a location next to the railroad bridge, in the same area, near the present Tourmobile facility; (3) a site on Ohio Drive near the Washington Channel, now occupied by a ball field; (4) the Rock Creek Park stables, which could be expanded but are not at all convenient to the Mall area.

The Chairman said any structure in the vicinity of the bridges or Ohio Drive would be very visible to people coming over the bridges, and he would actually prefer a well designed structure on the present Mall site, where it is hardly noticed because of the trees. Because of the objections to this site, however, the Chairman suggested that the Park Service continue to investigate other possibilities. The members also thought that other stable designs of better architectural quality should be considered; the red painted farm type wood stables shown in the slides were not acceptable. EXHIBIT E

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 11/MAR/80 - 2, Old Post Office, improvements to Pennsylvania Avenue, between 10th and 13th Streets. Charles Gueli from PADC showed a revised design for the triangular area in front of the Post Office, based on the Commission's recommendations at a previous meeting. The repetition of the Post Office arches had been retained, as had the general color scheme, although with the addition of more grey granite, but the pattern in the center was more free in form and focused on the Franklin Statue rather than parallel the axes of the Avenue. It was approved. EXHIBIT F

III. LEGISLATION

A. Office of Management and Budget

1. CFA 11/MAR/80 - 3, Request views on H.R. 4279, "To establish a commission to study the feasibility of construction of a monument dedicated to the duties and responsibilities of citizens of the United States." The Secretary said the Department of the Interior had no objection to this but did not know how much support it would have. The Chairman said he was not sure how it would be translated into visual terms, but felt the Commission could not object to the concept. EXHIBIT G

B. Committee on Governmental Affairs

1. CFA 11/MAR/80 - 4, Request views on S. 1814, "A bill to provide for a National Afro-American History and Culture Commission, which shall establish the National Center of Afro-American History and Culture, and for other purposes." There was no objection to this bill. EXHIBIT F

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Signed,



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF THE
POTOMAC RIVER SHORELINE

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, RECREATION,
AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 1495

A BILL TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN LANDS SO AS TO ASSURE THE
PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF THE POTOMAC RIVER
SHORELINE

MARCH 3, 1980

Publication No. 96-108



Printed for the use of the
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON 1980

63-163 O

EXHIBIT A

Senator HATHFIELD: If we can put a new east wing of the gallery down there that would be more attractive.

Mr. CHURDS: I think that would be out of scale.

Senator HATHFIELD: A small version.

Thank you very much.

I would like to invite Mr. J. Carter Brown, Chairman of the District of Columbia Fine Arts Commission, to speak.

Mr. Brown, we are happy to welcome you here, and Mr. Charles Atherton, who is accompanying you today. Please proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF J. CARTER BROWN, CHAIRMAN, D.C. FINE ARTS COMMISSION, ACCOMPANIED BY CHARLES ATHERTON

Mr. BROWN: Thank you, Senator.

The Commission of Fine Arts, which is mandated by this Congress and by the President of the United States, to watch over the esthetic dimension of the Nation's Capital and particularly over the historic area of Georgetown under the Georgetown Act, has taken a special interest in the waterfront for a long period of time, and at a date just prior to the Bicentennial initiated once again attention to this area by writing to the Mayor that the entire lateral on both sides of the river was of primary concern, and particularly the area that were not yet taken care of, one of which, as has been brought out in these testimonies, it is not the only area, but certainly one of which is the blighted Georgetown waterfront, which has got to be of the dimension of a national disaster.

The Commission later wrote to the Secretary of the Interior in late 1977 specifically proposing an all park solution to this area, and I wanted to stress how seriously the Commission takes this part of the capital by virtue of its enormous esthetic significance. It is the gateway, it is what one sees first as one approaches the city from either of its major airports, driving along beautifully landscaped and maintained public highways, coming from Dulles or National Airport, there is the sight of the city with the Capitol dome, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the edge of the city so beautifully landscaped along almost all of it except for that piece of Georgetown.

It is important also from other parts of the city as one drives along the major artery of K Street, one would see the bulk of any new development on this area looming up and out of scale with the Georgetown scale, which is a historically significant one.

And from the site itself, of course, there are superb vistas up and down the river across to the national park which is the Roosevelt Memorial, with its guarantee as a bird sanctuary into perpetuity, looking up the Potomac, and standing there one has an extraordinary opportunity to drink in the whole grandeur of the sight which our forefathers chose to be the capital of this country.

This, therefore, it seems to us, should be something freely enjoyable by the citizens of this country as a whole, and, therefore, we have always favored an all park solution as the ideal way out.

There is another consideration which is the status of development of the Georgetown area of the city which we feel is on the

Senator HATHFIELD: Do you know of any design that has been developed or is in the process that deals with the Whitehurst Freeway given the assumption that we are going to have it with us for some time, that would be more attractive or desirable than an all park?

Mr. BROWN: I do not know of one so far. The original submission under the development scheme was rejected by the Fine Arts Commission unanimously as being hopelessly inadequate on a variety of fronts, one being scale.

It was a behemoth plunked down on the waterfront and also an architectural approach where it tried to take some of the elements of the small scale historic residential areas of Georgetown and simply go on repeating them and blowing them up so that it produced a kind of dizziness that I think no one was very happy with.

I do not, however, want to prejudge the new submission which comes before the Board tomorrow and which will be reviewed by the full Commission at its next meeting.

Senator HATHFIELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Brown.

Mr. ABERNATHY: do you have any comments?

Mr. ABERNATHY: No, sir.

Senator HATHFIELD: I invite Mr. Herbert Miller, Georgetown Harbor Associates, developer with Chessie, to come forward.

Mr. MILLER: Senator Hatfield, members of the subcommittee.

Senator HATHFIELD: We are happy to have you here, Mr. Miller. We have your full statement, which will be placed in the record. You may either read it or summarize or highlight it.

Would you introduce your colleague?

STATEMENT OF HERBERT S. MILLER, PRESIDENT, GEORGETOWN HARBOR ASSOCIATES, ACCOMPANIED BY BILL TURNER, PROJECT MANAGER, WESTERN DEVELOPMENT CORP., AND GEORGETOWN HARBOR ASSOCIATES

Mr. MILLER: The c. Bill Turner, project manager for Western Development Corp. and Georgetown Harbor Associates.

Our other partner in the company could not attend today and is introducing a written statement to you.

Senator HATHFIELD: That will be made a part of the record, too.

Mr. MILLER: I believe there are other statements that will be submitted.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, it is a privilege to appear before you to discuss the future of the Georgetown waterfront. As a resident of Georgetown for 16 years and the head of a Georgetown-based Metropolitan Washington development firm, this is a subject of much interest and concern to me.

In its present condition, the Georgetown waterfront below K Street has remained too long a neglected backwater with its cement batching plant and its public and private storage areas. Simply stated, it is a disgrace.

As a result of the initiative of Senator Charles Mathias of Maryland, there is now hope that the condition of blight and decay can be ended with the waterfront being restored as an active people place, an asset to Georgetown, the District of Columbia and the Nation.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

March 7, 1980

Georgetown Waterfront Development

The Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown, at its meeting on 4 March 1980, met with architects representing the Western Development Corporation to consider revised designs for a large scale commercial-residential development proposed for the Georgetown waterfront between 31st Street and Rock Creek Park. For purposes of identification the application was numbered O.G. 80-40.

At the beginning of the meeting, the Board members reaffirmed their support for proposals to establish a national park on this site for all the reasons previously reported to the Commission.

When Western Development's project was initially reviewed by the Board at its 4 December 1979 meeting, by far the most objectionable feature was the massive size and scale of the proposed development. Although the extent of the structure along K Street has been reduced by eliminating most construction west of 31st Street, it nevertheless still presents a formidable mass facing the historic district above K Street, and beyond. In fact the additional height of some fifteen or sixteen feet more than the original proposal adds to the visual impact of the overall bulk despite its reduced length. The Board strongly advises that new construction in the waterfront area of Georgetown should conform with the Commission's policy of limiting building heights to sixty feet.

Much has been done by the architect toward achieving a lively, interesting design. Plan elements such as retention of the existing rights-of-way of the public streets and the introduction of the elliptical boat basin as a spatial focus for the project help considerably. Variations are also introduced into the architectural treatment of the facades, ranging from smaller scale residential on the east and west ends of the project to a larger scale treatment around the boat basin, where the facades tend toward a style more suggestive of exposition buildings. If these

March 7, 1980
Georgetown Waterfront Development

positive features were combined with a reduction of the excessive bulk and height, the Board feels the project would have merit. The Board accordingly recommends further study in this direction.

During the presentation there were statements in opposition to the project from private citizens, representatives of the Citizens Association of Georgetown and elected Advisory Neighborhood Commissions. In the course of the discussion, questions were raised in regard to traffic impact and the fact that the site is a known flood plain. The Board is aware of the flood plain conditions but does not feel the issue is within its purview since its role is to advise on the architectural design. This also applies to the obvious problem of the traffic congestion that will most likely result from this proposal in combination with all the other projects planned in the waterfront area. The Board recommends that relevant planning agencies give this most careful consideration.

The Board of Architectural
Consultants for Georgetown



Thomas W. D. Wright



Theodore A. Sande



David N. Yerkes

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KIVIN ROCHI

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 17, 1980

Dear Mr. Moore:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on March 11, 1980, considered revised designs for Western Development Corporation's proposed residential-commercial complex on the Georgetown waterfront. The application, which was submitted for conceptual review under the Old Georgetown Act, was identified as O.G. 80-42 and listed the address at 3020 K Street, N.W.

I should like to say at the outset, that the Commission is delighted to support Mayor Barry's position favoring an all park scheme for the Georgetown waterfront, a proposal long recommended by the Commission and now pending before the Congress. The Commission, however, feels it is obligated to review projects for the development of the waterfront with a view toward achieving the best possible design in the event the legislation is not enacted, and it is in that context that we are making our report.

As a part of the review process, the Commission's Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown considered Western Development's proposal at its meeting on March 4, and subsequently submitted a written report to the Commission on its findings. After reviewing their report, and after examining models and drawings of the project and hearing testimony both supporting and opposing it, the Commission voted to adopt the Board's recommendations to reject the design in its present form.

We agree with the report that there are a number of positive features in the newly designed scheme, including preservation of existing public rights of way, a somewhat shortened length of construction facing K Street, and a more lively architectural character. Also the introduction of a boat basin is a most appropriate addition. Historically the area along the river's edge was a bustling port, and the creation of a harbor environment makes a deft recall of this early period.

...2/

However, as the Board points out, the bulk and height of the buildings are still excessive. The Commission strongly believes that the project should be lowered to conform to its policy limiting height of new construction to sixty feet above grade in the waterfront area of Georgetown. Lowering the building heights should enhance the positive attributes of the design and would help alleviate the impact this development will inevitably have on the waterfront and the historic district north of K Street.

While the Commission indicated conceptual approval of certain elements of the project south of the line of Virginia Avenue, notably the boat basin and the general character of the architecture framing this point, it should be made clear this action does not refer to detailed elevations, heights, and grades, since this information was not in a form complete enough to make any more exacting determination. In this regard, certain discrepancies were noted between the models and the drawings, especially in the area of building heights. Obviously, it will be necessary to have all descriptive documents in agreement before the Commission can take any final action on these elements of the design. Future submissions should address this problem as well as clarify all elevations of the public rights of way, and the bulkhead along the river in comparison to existing grades.

I am attaching a copy of the Board's report as a part of the Commission's action.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "J. Carter Brown CA". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the initials "CA" at the end.

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Robert L. Moore
Mayor's Agent for
Historic Preservation
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

March 6, 1980

Dear Mr. Moore:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered O.G. 80-31 and O.G. 80-22, a pair of applications concerning construction of a permanent bank and a temporary banking facility proposed for 2929 M Street, N.W., in the Georgetown Historic District. The Commission realizes that both proposals involve razing the existing Exxon Gas station, such demolition subject to formal review in the near future.

During the Commission meeting on February 12, 1980, we conferred with the architect, Mr. James Murphy, and representatives of the National Savings and Trust. Although the Commission questions the appropriateness of erecting temporary facilities anywhere in the historic district, we have agreed to an exception in this case with the clear understanding that the temporary structure be well designed, be located to the rear of the construction site, and be removed by a pre-determined date.

The Commission voiced its interest in the concept of an octagonal design for the permanent facility, but believe a more comprehensive development of the site should be considered by the owners before developing the scheme further. In discussing the design at hand, however, it became apparent that additional study was needed to establish a well defined relationship between the octagonal element and its auxiliary structures, especially the entrance and gateway to the drive-in facility and parking lot. We look forward to a continued review of the designs and expect to work with the applicant toward an acceptable development of this site.

Sincerely yours,



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Robert L. Moore
Mayor's Agent for Historic
Preservation
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20576

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDRICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

LEE S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

April 1, 1980

Dear Mr. Moore:

I am writing in regard to the plans for expanding the Korean Chancery at 2320 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. (S.L. 80-20 and 21) which the Commission reviewed at its meeting on March 11, 1980.

The Commission has no objection to alterations of the existing building nor to the general design of the proposed new wings. However, the massing and bulk of the wings closest to the park should be reduced in size and set back farther from the rim of the park.

This should help to minimize the effect on the Park which is the principal concern of the Commission.

We will be happy to consider revised designs at our meeting on April 8.

Sincerely yours,



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Robert L. Moore
Mayor's Agent for Historic
Preservation
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20576

April 1, 1980

Dear Mr. Fish:

The Commission was happy to review alternate locations for the Park Police Stables now located near the Lincoln Memorial between the Reflecting Pool and Independence Avenue. Though adequate design and screening efforts may make the present site feasible, the Commission felt that a site in East Potomac Park near the headquarters building may be possible as well.

In this connection we pass on two additional thoughts: First, the Commission still urges that a comprehensive plan for East Potomac Park be undertaken as soon as possible. You will recall this recommendation was made at the time temporary facilities for Landmarks Tourmobile were reviewed. The development of the area around Park Service headquarters continues on an ad hoc basis, which is not the best of situations, since the site is an important and highly visible gateway to the Capital from Virginia, and should be well planned.

Secondly, the Commission recommended that if the stables are to be permanently located in Potomac Park, they be specially designed for the site and not a prefabricated structure such as the one presented at our meeting. There is ample precedent for stables in urban parks where the buildings actually contribute to the setting. Such an approach is preferable to erecting a temporary utilitarian structure and then screening it from public view with landscaping.

We will be happy to work closely with the Park Service on this project.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Manus J. Fish
National Park Service
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

April 1, 1980

Dear Mr. Barnes:

The Commission was pleased with the revised designs for the special paving in front of the Old Post Office Building. Charles Guelf told us of efforts by PADC and Ms. Kasuba to study several alternatives to the scheme presented to us in February. The resulting design is much better and is approved.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. W. Anderson Barnes
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue
Development Corporation
Suite 1148
425 Washington, D.C. 20004

April 1, 1980

Dear Mr. Peterson:

Per your request, The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on March 11, 1980, reviewed Interior's report on H.R. 4279, "To establish a commission to study the feasibility of constructing a monument dedicated to the duties and responsibilities of citizen's of the United States."

The Commission concurs with the Interior Department report. While we have no objection to the establishment of such a commission, we would agree that the legislation should be amended to include a provision for Federal and State consultation and coordination.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Ronald K. Peterson
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference
Office of Management
and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

April 1, 1980

Dear Senator Ribicoff:

I am writing in reply to your letter of February 22, 1980 requesting the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on S. 1814 "To provide for a National Afro-American History and Culture Commission, and the establishment of a National Center of Afro-American History and Culture."

The Commission favors the enactment of this legislation and would be delighted to assist in an advisory capacity in the design of the Center if such a facility is eventually recommended.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

The Honorable
Abraham Ribicoff
Chairman
U.S. Senate
Committee on Governmental
Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20510

